UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,428	11/19/2003	Thomas R. Wells	63288-386 [5384/5546]	7011

7590   01/15/2008
McDEROTT,WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER
PRESTON, JOHN O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4143	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/717,428	WELLS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN O. PRESTON	4143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 November 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07/26/04</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/02/04</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____

<div align="center">**DETAILED ACTION**</div>

<div align="center">**Status of Claims**</div>

1.   This action is in reply to the application filed on November 19, 2003.

2.   Claims 1-36 are currently pending and have been examined.

<div align="center">*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*</div>

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8:   Claim 8 is vague and indefinite because it makes reference to itself in the following limitation: *The method of claim 8, further comprising the step of.* For purpose of examination the claim is interpreted as depending from Claim 6.

Claim 9:   Claim 9 is vague and indefinite because it makes reference to itself in the following limitation: *The method of claim 9, further comprising the step of.* For purpose of examination the claim is interpreted as depending from Claim 6.

<div align="center">*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*</div>

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said

subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention

was made.

6.   Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Funk (US 6,059,185) in view of DiNapoli (US 6,826,445 B2).

Claim 1:   Funk discloses the following limitations, but does not disclose any other

limitations:

- *obtaining account information from a check document* (Funk, column 2,

  lines 37-43)

- *comparing the account information from said check document to account*

  information from a bank document to verify a match (Funk, column 2,

  lines 45-55)

However, DiNapoli discloses the following limitation:

- *associating the check document with the bank document upon verifying*

  a match (DiNapoli, column 2, lines 45-65)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the processing method of Funk with the mailing technique of DiNapoli because

"…the traditional check processing procedure is a time-consuming and tedious process"

(DiNapoli, column 2, lines 1-7).

Claim 4:   Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. In regard to

the limitation of *wherein said bank document is a bank statement*, DiNapoli further

discloses a matched mailing system that pairs bank statements with related cancelled

checks (DiNapoli, column 2, lines 45-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the processing method of Funk by

applying the matching technique of DiNapoli because matching checks to related bank

statements is an effective method of verifying a customer's account activity.

Claim 5:   Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. DiNapoli

further discloses *wherein said method is employed during a mail insertion operation*

(DiNapoli column 1, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the sorting method of Funk with the mailing technique of DiNapoli because it would improve efficiency to avoid having to manually reconcile more than one collation in an over-count error (DiNapoli column 3, lines 15-24).

Claim 10:   Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 9. DiNapoli further discloses *diverting said set of check documents containing said identified mismatched check document* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the processing method of Funk with the mailing technique of DiNapoli because providing for an automated method of removing identified errors improves processing speed and efficiency.

Claim 13:   Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1. With regard to the limitation of *wherein said account information is a character string comprising a plurality of characters*, Funk further discloses a system where account information in the form of a string of characters is read from a check (Funk, column 1, lines 39-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the data capture method of Funk with the matching technique of DiNapoli because the ability to obtain account information displayed as a character string adds extra utility to the matching component of the mail insertion process.

Claim 36:   Funk discloses the following limitations, but does not disclose any other limitations:

- *means for determining account information from each check in a set of check documents* (Funk, column 1, lines 39-45)

However, DiNapoli discloses the following limitations:

- *means for determining account information from a bank statement* (DiNapoli, column 2, lines 45-65)

- *means for determining whether said check document account information matches said bank statement account information* (DiNapoli, column 2, lines 45-65)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the data capture method of Funk with the matching technique of DiNapoli because it would improve efficiency to avoid having to manually reconcile more than one collation in an over-count error (DiNapoli column 3, lines 15-24).

7.   Claims 2, 15-20, 22, 23, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill (US 5,678,046 A) in view of Funk (US 6,059,185 A).

Claim 2:   Cahill discloses the limitations of:

- *capturing an image of at least a portion of each of a plurality of check documents in a set of check documents* (Cahill, column 14, lines 55-65);

- *determining account information from said image for each of the plurality of check documents* (Cahill, column 14, lines 60-67, account information is read from the MICR line of the check thus determining account information).

Cahill does not disclose the limitation of *comparing the account information of at least one said plurality of check documents to the account information of at least one other check document in said set of check documents to determine a match*. However, Funk discloses a process that compares account information from paper checks to account information taken from other checks and downloaded to a database in order to determine a match (Funk, column 2, line 55-column 3, line 5). It would be obvious to modify the image capturing system and method of Cahill to incorporate the "matching" system and method taught in Funk because the traditional check processing procedure is a time-consuming and tedious process and otherwise each time a check is handled or encoded, an opportunity for error is introduced (see Funk, column 2, lines 1-7).

Claim 15:   Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 2. With regard to the limitation of *wherein said check set is matched with at least one second set of check documents, wherein each set contains account information for related accounts*, Funk further discloses a method of matching paper checks based on similar account information (Funk, column 1, lines 39-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the data capture method of Cahill with the matching technique of Funk because "...the traditional check processing procedure is a time-consuming and tedious process" (DiNapoli, column 2, lines1-7).

Claim 16:   Cahill discloses the following limitations, but does not disclose any other limitations:

- *passing a check document set through a check feeder device, wherein said set comprises at least one check document* (Cahill, column 14, lines 20-25);

- *imaging each check document in said set via an imaging device to create an image* (Cahill, column 8, lines 25-35);

- *determining account information for each check document from each said image* (Cahill, column 5, line 65-column 6, line 5);

However, Funk discloses the following limitation:

- *comparing said account information from each check document in said set to account number information on a bank document* (Funk, column 2, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check feeder of Cahill, the imaging and account information capturing methods of Cahill, and the matching technique of Funk because providing for the methods and apparatus mentioned above increases the speed, utility, and efficiency of the mail insertion process.

Claim 18:   Cahill discloses the limitation of *an imaging device, wherein said check document imaging device images at least a portion of each check document in a set of check documents* (Cahill, column 8, lines 25-33), but does not disclose any other limitations.   However, **Funk** discloses *a computer, said computer in communication with said imaging device, wherein said computer reads at least a portion of said image of each said check document for account number information and compares the account information of each check document in said set to account information from every other check document in said set* (Funk, column 2, lines 36-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the imaging methods of Cahill with the system of Funk because providing for the methods and apparatus mentioned above increases the speed, utility, and efficiency of the mail insertion process.

Claim 19:   Cahill discloses the limitation of *an imaging device, wherein said imaging device images at least a portion of each check document in a set of check documents* (Cahill, column 8, lines 25-33). Cahill further discloses *a computer, said computer in communication with said imaging device* (Cahill, column 8, lines 30-46)*, wherein said computer reads at least a portion of said image of each said check document for account information* (Cahill, column 5, line 65-column 6, line 2), but does not disclose any other limitations. However, Funk discloses the limitation of *and compares the account information of each check document in said set to account information from a bank document to determine a match* (Funk, column 2, lines 45-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the imaging method of Cahill with the matching technique of Funk because the aforementioned combination eliminates the need for inefficient methods of check storage and retrieval.

Claim 20:   Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 19. Cahill further discloses the limitation of *a bank document imaging device, wherein said bank document imaging device images at least a portion of said bank document containing account number information* (Cahill, column 1, lines 10-20; column 14, lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check processing method of Funk with the technique of Cahill because providing a means to generate an image of bank documents during processing eliminates the need for inefficient methods of document storage and retrieval.

Claim 22:   Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 21. Cahill further discloses *wherein said trigger device comprises: a trigger sensor, positioned to sense the presence of a document* (Cahill, column 16, lines 18-24)*; a trigger mechanism operatively connected to said imaging device for activating said imaging device* (Cahill, column 16, lines 28-35)*; and a trigger amplifier, operatively connecting said trigger sensor and said trigger mechanism* (Cahill, column 16, lines 18-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check processing method of Funk with the technique of Cahill because providing a means to generate an image of documents during processing eliminates the need for inefficient methods of document storage and retrieval.

Claim 23:   Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 21. Cahill further discloses *wherein said imaging device is a digital, region of interest camera* (Cahill, column 14, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check processing method of Funk with the technique of Cahill because providing a means to generate an image of documents during processing eliminates the need for inefficient methods of document storage and retrieval.

Claim 32: Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 19. Funk further discloses *wherein said account information comprises a character string of numbers* (Funk, column 1, lines 39-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cahill with the data capturing technique of Funk because the ability to read account information comprised of a character string adds functionality to the mail insertion system and makes it more versatile.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/DiNapoli as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cahill.

Claim 3: Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose the limitation of *capturing an image of at least a portion of said check document*. However, Cahill discloses a document imaging machine that captures an image of both sides of a check (Cahill, column 8, lines 25-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the processing method of Funk/DiNapoli with the document imaging technique of Cahill because the use of digital images to identify checks provides a more cost effective method of handling and storing checks (Cahill, column 3, lines 36-45).

9. Claims 6, 7, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/DiNapoli and further in view of Guiles (US 6,607,190 B1).

Claim 6: Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose the limitations of *monitoring the position of said bank document; and regulating merger of said check documents with said bank document*. However, Guiles discloses a system for controlling the spacing between documents as they are merged together for mail insertion (Guiles, column 1, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the matching method of Funk/DiNapoli

with the spacing technique of Guiles because monitoring the position of documents during the mail insertion process lessens the risks of jams or other integrity-compromising events (Guiles, column 3, lines 4-8).

Claim 7:   Funk/DiNapoli/Guiles discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 6. DiNapoli further discloses the limitation of *identifying mismatches between check documents and said bank document* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 1-10).

Claim 12:   Funk/DiNapoli/Guiles discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 7. DiNapoli further discloses the limitation of *wherein said mismatched document is marked as mismatched error document* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-25).

Claim 11:   Funk/DiNapoli/Guiles discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 12. DiNapoli further discloses the limitation of *diverting said bank document containing said mismatched document* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-25).

10.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/DiNapoli and further in view of Jones (6,526,574 B1).

Claim 14:   Funk/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose the limitation of *wherein said account information is matched using mismatch tolerance levels.* However, Jones discloses a method of matching two character strings with a predetermined tolerance level (Jones, column 7, line 60-column 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the matching method of Funk/DiNapoli with the matching tolerance levels of Jones because doing so would add flexibility to the mail insertion process and improve efficiency.

11.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Funk and further in view of Smith (US 2,294,809).

Claim 21:   Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 20. Cahill further discloses *a camera, said camera positioned to obtain an image of at least a portion of said check document* (Cahill, column 16, lines 18-44)*; and a trigger*

device, said trigger device sensing said check document and activating said camera to obtain an image of said check document (Cahill, column 16, lines 18-44). Cahill/Funk does not disclose any other limitation. However, Smith discloses a light source, said light source illuminating said document (Smith, page 2, lines 9-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the document processing method of Cahill/Funk with the light source of Smith because the use of a light source during the imaging process improves the quality of the image.

12.   Claims 24-26 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill, and in view of DiNapoli.

Claim 24:   Cahill discloses the limitation of having a bank document imaging device positioned to image bank documents traveling along an AIM conveyor (Cahill, column 14, lines 55-67: the imager being an imaging device); a check feeder, having a check document imaging device positioned to image check documents merging with said AIM conveyor (Cahill, column 14, lines 15-30; the digital imager being an imaging device); and a computer for processing images obtained from the bank document imaging device and the check document imaging device for comparison of account information (Cahill, column 10, lines 45-55). Cahill does not disclose any other limitations. However, DiNapoli discloses the limitation of an automated in-line mailing device (AIM) (DiNapoli, column 1, lines 5-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the imaging method of Cahill with the document processing technique of DiNapoli because the electronic storage and processing of check images improves the efficiency of the mail insertion process.

Claim 25:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 24. DiNapoli further discloses a document control system, said document control system in communication with said computer, wherein said document control

system operates with said computer to regulate said check documents and said bank statements during a mail insertion operation (DiNapoli, column 8, lines 25-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill with the processing technique of DiNapoli because it is more efficient to have a computer regulate the process and avoid having to have an operator manually reconcile more than one collation in case of an error (DiNapoli, column 3, lines 15-22).

Claim 26:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 24. DiNapoli further discloses *a control panel, said control panel in communication with said computer* (DiNapoli, column 8, lines 30-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill with the processing technique of DiNapoli because it is more efficient to have a computer regulate the process and avoid having to have an operator manually reconcile more than one collation in case of an error (DiNapoli, column 3, lines 15-22).

Claim 28:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 24. DiNapoli further discloses *wherein said check feeder is halted when a mismatch between said bank document and said check document is detected by said computer* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill with the processing technique of DiNapoli because it is more efficient to have a computer regulate the process and avoid having to have an operator manually reconcile more than one collation in case of an error (DiNapoli, column 3, lines 15-22).

Claim 29:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 24. DiNapoli further discloses *wherein said check feeder marks mismatched check documents for diverting* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-25). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill with the processing technique of DiNapoli because it is more efficient to have a computer regulate the process and avoid having to have an operator manually reconcile more than one collation in case of an error (DiNapoli, column 3, lines 15-22).

Claim 30:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 24. DiNapoli further discloses *wherein said check feeder diverts mismatched check documents* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the imaging method of Cahill with the mailing technique of DiNapoli because providing for an automated method of removing identified errors improves processing speed and efficiency.

Claim 31:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 24. DiNapoli further discloses *wherein said AIM diverts mismatched checks and statement documents* (DiNapoli, column 10, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the imaging method of Cahill with the mailing technique of DiNapoli because providing for an automated method of removing identified errors improves processing speed and efficiency.

13.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/DiNapoli, and further in view of Guiles.

Claim 27:   Cahill/DiNapoli discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 25, but does not disclose any other limitations. However, Guiles discloses *a drive assembly for controlling the rate of checks passing through the check feeder* (Guiles, column 9, lines 15-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill/DiNapoli with the check feeder technique of Guiles because implementing a method to regulate how checks are fed into the insertion system reduces

mechanical failures due to jams and increases the overall performance of the system.

14. Claims 17 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Funk and further in view of DiNapoli.

Claim 17: Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 16. Cahill further discloses the following limitations, but does not disclose any other limitations:

- *imaging said bank document via a second imaging device* (Cahill, column 1, lines 10-20; column 14, lines 55-65)*; and*

- *determining account information for said document* (Cahill, column 14, lines 55-65).

However, DiNapoli discloses the limitation of:

- *loading a bank document onto an automatic inserter machine* (DiNapoli, column 5, lines 40-67)*;*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill/Funk with the document processing technique of DiNapoli because providing for a method to load bank documents into an insertion machine improves the efficiency of the mail insertion process as it relates to bank documents.

Claim 34: Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 21, but does not disclose any other limitations. However, DiNapoli discloses *wherein said computer matches check document sets which contain related account information to said bank document* (DiNapoli, column 2, lines 45-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill/Funk with the matching technique of DiNapoli because implementing a method for matching check documents with related account information to an associated bank statement is essential to the use of a

high-volume mail insertion system for mailing bank statements accompanied by any associated checks.

15.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Funk and further in view of Jones.

Claim 35:   Cahill/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim 21, but does not disclose any other limitations. However, Jones discloses *wherein said computer matches said check documents to said bank documents using selectable mismatch tolerance levels* (Jones, column 7, line 60-column 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Cahill/Funk with the matching technique of Jones because implementing a matching technique that makes use of tolerance levels provides to the user more control over the mail insertion process.

16.   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **John Preston** whose telephone number is **571.270.3918.** The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **JAMES REAGAN** can be reached at **571.272.6710.**

17.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov >. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

18.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to **571-273-8300**

19.   Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Customer Service Window:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

/John O Preston/Examiner, Art Unit 4143
January 10, 2008
/James A. Reagan/Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4143